
1

Action Item

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Approval of the Minutes of the March 9-10, March 30,
and May 21, 2004 Meetings

MINUTES

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Meeting of March 9-10, 2004

**Commissioners
present** Howard Welinsky *Chair*
Olivia K. Singh, *Vice Chair*
Carol Chandler
Irwin S. Field*
Odessa P. Johnson
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.*
Rachel E. Shetka
Faye Washington**
Dezie Woods-Jones
**March 9th only*
***March 10th only*

**Commissioners
absent**
Alan S. Arkatov
George T. Caplan
Reed Hastings
Hugo Morales
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Evonne Seron Schulze

Call to order Commission Chair Welinsky called the March 9, 2004, meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission to order at 9:45 a.m. in Room 2040 of the State Capitol.

**Report of the
Executive Director** Executive Director Robert Moore announced his resignation. The commissioners thanked him for his service during the difficult time faced by the Commission.

**Report of the
Statutory Advisory
Committee** Statutory Advisory Committee Chair Ron Fox announced that Superintendent Jack O'Connell has proposed a major high school initiative, and that the Superintendent would be available to address the Commission regarding his initiative at its June meeting. Mr. Fox also announced new appointments at the University, State University, and the community colleges and noted that Karen Yelverton Zamarripa would assume the chair of the Committee henceforth.

**Recommendations
on Higher Education
Policies Contained
in the Governor's
Proposed 2004-05
State Budget** Mr. Engelbach presented the staff's recommendation on higher education budget proposals contained in the Governor's 2004-05 budget. He focused his discussion on student fees and financial aid.

Commissioner Woods-Jones asked what criteria were used for defining bad economic times in which fees could be increased by more than the increase in per capita income.

Mr. Engelbach responded that the Governor determines the criteria.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the Commission had not adopted a policy in December 2002 that was supportive of ending the boom and bust cycle and bringing stability to student fees.

Mr. Engelbach responded that it had done so.

Commissioner Chandler reiterated her support for the position that increases in fees should be predictable.

Commissioner Johnson noted that there were other programs, such as nursing, which are candidates for reduced fees. A case could be made that fee increases should be modest for other programs such as teacher credentialing.

Commissioner Field noted that it would be easy to make a case that a particular high demand profession should receive special treatment regarding fee increases, similar to that proposed for teacher credentialing programs.

Commissioner Rodriguez indicated his support for this view.

Commissioner Johnson asked if any other proposals regarding community college fee increases had been proposed.

Mr. Engelbach said that some interests had proposed a smaller increase.

Commissioner Johnson said that a case should be made that the increase should be similar to other segments. She asked how much money the community colleges would receive as a result of Proposition 55 (the statewide capital facilities bond initiative).

Mr. Engelbach responded that community colleges would receive more than a one-third share of total bond dollars, in contrast to earlier bond issues where all three segments received equal shares.

Mr. Engelbach then presented the staff recommendation on community colleges fees for baccalaureate-degree holders, and noted that last time there was a difference in fees, enrollment by baccalaureate-degree holders fell by 50 percent.

Commissioner Singh noted that with layoffs in the high tech industry, many university graduates might be seeking training for new careers, and that such an increase might adversely affect students with baccalaureate degrees.

Commissioner Woods-Jones said that the cumulative impact of all the fee and financial aid proposals should be assessed before accepting the proposal to decouple UC and CSU Cal Grant awards.

Mr. Engelbach completed his presentation, indicating that both UC and CSU would receive no state support to fund enrollment growth. He noted that the Commission's forthcoming eligibility study might help inform policy makers as to the extent that such a policy might have on student enrollment.

Commissioner Rodriguez said that the proposal to not fund enrollment growth would set a bad precedent.

Call of the roll	With a quorum present, Commission Chair Welinsky called the roll.
Approval of the minutes	A motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting was proposed by Commissioner Rodriguez and second by Commissioner Chandler. The motion was carried unanimously.
Continuation of Staff Recommendations on Governor's Budget Proposals	<p>Chair Welinsky called on Chancellor Carol Thomlinson-Keasey to respond to the Commission staff recommendation regarding UC Merced. She said that much would be lost if funding for UC Merced was delayed. She noted that some faculty had already been hired and that they were expected to do critical research on water, snow, and air quality issues. She said an opportunity for such research would be lost if funding for the campus was decreased.</p> <p>Chair Welinsky then called on Penny Edgert from the Intersegmental Coordinating Committee to address the Commission regarding her concerns about the impact of the Governor's proposals. Ms. Edgert expressed her concerns about proposed cuts to academic preparation programs. She said that the MESA and Puente programs were particularly valuable and urged the Commission to advocate restoration of funding for these programs.</p> <p>Chair Welinsky then acknowledged Mary Gill, Interim Vice Chancellor for Governmental Relations of the California Community Colleges, who requested to address the Commission. Ms. Gill noted that many of the Governor's proposals threatened the ability of students to transfer from a community college to a university. She added that diversion of 10 percent of students to the community colleges would result in severe enrollment pressures for the system. She continued by noting that such pressures could be exacerbated if students self-directed themselves.</p> <p>Chair Welinsky then called on Max Espinoza, from the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC), who expressed his concerns about the Commission's staff recommendation regarding Cal Grants A and B. He noted that CSAC has a commitment to offer grants to all qualified students, and that the Governor's proposal could undermine CSAC's commitment.</p> <p>Chair Welinsky noted that the staff recommendation was consistent with the Commission's previously adopted fee policy.</p> <p>Commissioner Woods-Jones said she was concerned about the cumulative impact of the Governor's proposal and was concerned about increasing fees by more than 10 percent.</p> <p>Chair Welinsky said he was opposed to a 40 percent increase because it was not moderate, gradual, and predictable.</p> <p>Commissioner Johnson said the 40 percent increase was significant, but may be unavoidable given UC's budget. She said that the alternative would be to raise undergraduate fees by more than 10 percent.</p>

Commissioner Chandler said that increasing financial aid might mitigate the fee increase.

Commissioner Woods-Jones suggested that some professions, in addition to teaching training, would merit exemption from the proposed increase in graduate fees.

Commissioner Chandler proposed adding “professions important to the needs of the state” to the exemption.

Commissioner Field stated that the Commission’s recommendation should also express concern on the debt load borne by people entering professions.

Commissioner Woods-Jones expressed her opposition to the Governor’s proposal to increase community college fees.

Commissioner Johnson said the community college percentage increase should be the same for all segments and that an increase to \$20 per unit would be more equitable.

Commissioner Woods-Jones also opposed the proposed fee increase for bachelor degree holders who wanted to attend a community college, and said it would have a devastating effect on enrollment.

Commissioner Rodriguez said the fee increase for bachelor degree holders attending a community college should be the same as for any other student, and no more than a 10 percent increase.

Mr. Engelbach said it was hard to determine the motives of bachelor’s degree holders who are attending community colleges. Some are seeking job retraining, while others are motivated by general interest.

Commissioner Woods-Jones said this issue had been discussed for many years.

Chair Welinsky said there seems to be a consensus to oppose this proposal.

There was a consensus to oppose the proposal to reduce the institutional student aid set aside.

With respect to the staff’s recommendation regarding Cal Grants, Commissioner Field said he was opposed to any reduction of grants or the amount of the awards. He said grant policy has long-term implications in limiting access and diversity, and that reducing grants was bad public policy, because recipients of grants are the most needy students.

Chair Welinsky said he also opposed the proposal to reduce Cal Grant income ceilings and to reduce the maximum award for students attending non-public institutions. He agreed with staff on the proposal to decouple CSU and UC Cal Grants from fee levels.

Mr. Engelbach noted that financial aid is the key to maintaining educational equity.

The Commissioners then discussed the proposal to limit enrollment growth at UC and CSU, and to divert 10 percent of UC and CSU freshmen to the community colleges.

Commissioner Rodriguez said that the way that the eligibility pools for each segment were defined was a more important issue, and that any Commission position on enrollment growth should be on the definition of the eligibility pool.

Commissioner Woods-Jones said she was opposed to any diversion of students to the community colleges.

The Commissioners agreed with the staff recommendation to support the proposal to provide for a 3 percent increase in enrollment growth at the community colleges.

Commissioner Woods-Jones noted her opposition to this proposal.

Regarding the proposal to eliminate general fund support for outreach programs at UC and CSU, Commissioner Chandler said she would like to continue to support programs that had measurable success and supported the staff's position.

Commissioner Rodriguez said he opposed the staff recommendation and that these programs had already suffered budget cuts. He added that the Commission should make a strong statement that these programs are needed for educational equity and recommended that the programs be retained.

Commissioner Chandler said she could not agree with a blanket approval.

Chair Welinsky said that the Commission had the choice of approving the staff proposal or adding an amendment proposed by Commissioner Rodriguez. He proposed that staff review the discussion and draft a proposal for future consideration by the Commission.

The Commissioners agreed with the staff recommendation regarding the proposal to increase student-faculty ratios at UC and CSU.

Commissioner Woods-Jones noted her opposition to the proposal to consolidate the community college categorical programs.

Commissioner Rodriguez expressed his support for the staff recommendation on the Governor's proposal to provide funding to allow UC Merced to enroll students in Fall 2005.

Commissioner Chandler said that enrollment should proceed as planned, given the investment that had already been made by the campus.

Commissioner Johnson said the staff recommendation was inconsistent with the Commission's earlier position in support of the campus.

The Commission then discussed a proposal to fund cost-of-living adjustments for salaries at the community colleges, but not UC and CSU.

Commissioner Woods-Jones supported the Governor's proposal because salaries at community colleges have lagged.

Commissioner Johnson said she supported the proposal on equity grounds.

Commissioner Chandler also said that she supported the Governor because salaries at community colleges have lagged.

There no longer being a quorum of the Commission present, Chair Welinsky asked the Commissioners to accept the staff recommendations with changes as proposed by

Commissioners and that a roll call vote would be cast once the Commission had once again a quorum.

**Recess/
Reconvene**

Chair Welinsky recessed the Commission at 11:55 a.m.

**Student Access,
Institutional
Capacity,
and Public Higher
Education
Enrollment
Demand,
2003 to 2013**

Staff member Stacy Wilson presented a report on enrollment demand.

Commissioner Singh asked how the report would be packaged and used by the Legislature.

Mr. Wilson responded that the report would be used to examine enrollment patterns and that he would provide an executive summary of his data.

Commissioner Johnson said that the report should lead the Commission to encourage more construction of joint-use facilities.

Commissioner Field asked if staff had compared the projections made in 1999 with actual enrollment levels and added that an executive summary should present this comparison.

Mr. Wilson noted that the projections were slightly lower than the actual 1999 enrollment levels.

**Strategic Plan
2004-09**

Staff member Murray Haberman presented a draft of the Commission's strategic plan. He noted that the plan was based on vision and mission statements, along with goals, that had been developed at its December meeting. He stated that a writing team consisting of Commission members and Commission staff expanded the proposed plan based on Commissioner and staff discussions.

Commissioner Field stated that goals should also reflect the stakeholders' views.

Commissioner Chandler asked whether the plan should be driven by the stakeholders or the Commission and added that the Commission should be an independent resource.

Chair Welinsky said that earlier he had met with legislative leaders and they said that the transfer and joint-use facility issues were important and should be part of the plan. He noted that the Commission was in a unique position to address these issues, and that they should be a high priority.

Commissioner Woods-Jones asked how the plan related to higher education budget issues, and asked what were the most achievable of the objectives listed in the plan.

Mr. Haberman responded that in 2003, staff of the Legislative Analyst's Office had met with stakeholders and there had been no consensus on what activities should be given up. He added that the strategic plan was an opportunity to look at larger issues. Mr. Haberman stated that the overriding concern for the Commission was to determine how to provide the greatest amount of access, and that another question to be addressed was what should be provided by the higher education systems.

Mr. Haberman added that the strategic plan also addressed more specific questions and said that the Commission's statutory requirements can be changed.

Commissioner Rodriguez said that the Commission should produce reports in a context that meets the objectives of the strategic plan.

Commissioner Johnson said the Commission needs a better sense of expectations from the Legislature.

Chair Welinsky proposed scheduling a special meeting to discuss the strategic plan.

Commissioner Chandler said that the objectives in the plan were ambitious.

Mr. Haberman said it would not be possible to complete them all, but that the current order of goals and objectives in the plan might indicate where the Commission wants to place its priorities.

Recess	Chair Welinsky recessed the Commission at 12:55 p.m.
---------------	--

Reconvene Commission Review of a Proposal by the Riverside Community College District to Convert the Moreno Valley Educational Center to a Full-Service Community College Campus and Commission Review of a Proposal by the Riverside Community College District to Convert the Norco Education Center to a Full-Service Community College Campus	<p>Chair Welinsky called on staff members Gil Velazquez and Stacy Wilson to provide an overview and their recommendations for two proposals for new campuses in the Riverside Community College District.</p> <p>Mr. Velazquez indicated that the proposal for Moreno Valley was thorough with respect to documenting the projected student growth to sustain conversion of the off-campus center to a full-service community college campus. He stated that the Inland Empire region, especially the southeast area served by the two Centers, has one of the fastest population growth rates in California. He also noted that the program offerings comport fully with academic and workforce needs for current and future students and with the socio-economic characteristics of the population in general.</p> <p>Mr. Velazquez stated that a local capital outlay bond initiative, Measure C for \$350 million, had recently passed and that it would ensure the financial viability of both proposed community college campuses. He concluded by pointing out the Moreno Valley proposal conforms to the Commission's facility guidelines, and that the district had provided detailed information that he requested with respect to staff "support" costs.</p> <p>Commissioner Johnson commended the district for moving this proposal at this time in light of the state's current fiscal crisis. She noted that the University of California at Riverside has historically been afforded the "luxury" of admitting every eligible student. With anticipated cutbacks, the move to expand educational opportunities by the community colleges for this region was timely.</p> <p>Commissioner Woods-Jones asked staff to describe any "down side" to the proposals.</p> <p>Although both the proposals were submitted jointly, staff member Stacy Wilson said that each was evaluated on its own merit and concurred with Mr. Velazquez's conclusion that the campuses should be approved to become full-service community college campuses. However, a similar request was made for the Norco proposal to provide the Commission staff more detailed information on proposed support budget.</p>
--	---

Mr. Wilson commended the District for their strategic placement of the two centers to afford maximum student access: Moreno Valley on the east end of the region; Norco on the west end; and Riverside Community College in the center.

Chair Welinsky introduced Salvatore Rotella, Superintendent of the Riverside Community College District, who noted that the district has been working on this plan for the past twelve years in collaboration with the K-12 sectors, public and private four-year institutions, business, labor, and community-based organizations. He said that the passage of Measure C, the \$350 local bond initiative, reaffirmed the community's commitment to expanding educational opportunity in the region. In addition, he noted that the District also received approximately \$2.5 million in federal support each year that would be used to supplement State and local resources.

Commissioner Field inquired about the proposed infrastructure and administrative costs among the three campuses and asked if any of those cost could be centralized.

Mr. Rotella responded that to the extent possible certain costs would be centralized, but there is recognition of the need for each community college to retain its separate identity to respond to local needs, and for faculty and staff to retain some autonomy.

There being no further questions, Chair Welinsky called for the vote to approve the new campuses. Commissioner Chandler moved the motion, second by Commissioner Woods-Jones. The motion carried unanimously.

Speaker
Presentation:
Steve Weiner,
Campaign for
College
Opportunity

Director Moore introduced Steve Weiner and recapped his career in a variety of teaching and administrative positions in California's public and private institutions of higher education.

Mr. Weiner expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to describe his new venture, the Campaign for College Opportunity. He noted that the Campaign was created in response to current State policies and his concern that hundreds of thousands of students might be denied access to a college education. He said a disproportionate number would come from groups characterized as poor or students of color.

Mr. Weiner stated that the State must keep its promise to provide access to and space for all students, a view shared by the founding members of the Campaign, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF), the California Business Round Table, and the Community College League of California (acting on behalf of local Trustees).

Mr. Weiner reviewed the Campaign's two primary purposes: first was to highlight problems and to put a face on those students who might be denied access, and to better inform and educate the public about the need for and benefits of higher education; and second to build a broad, bi-partisan coalition including business, labor, civic and religious organizations, community-based organizations to reverse current trends.

He noted that the Campaign was supported by a grant from the Hewlett Foundation and a contribution from a student association at Santa Rosa Community College.

Mr. Weiner acknowledged the Commission's long-standing support for educational opportunity and access and called upon the body to work with the Campaign in this important undertaking.

**State Licensure
versus
Accreditation of
Proprietary
Schools and
Colleges – A
Review and
Comparison of
Roles and
Functions**

Chair Welinsky called on staff member Marge Chisholm to present this item. She noted that over 400,000 students are enrolled in the California's private postsecondary schools and that the Commission has been involved in efforts to ensure quality for this sector.

She stated that three situations prompted the staff to undertake this review: (1) the large number of exemptions currently in place or proposed for schools under the State licensure process; (2) the impending "sunset" date for the Public Private School Reform Act now under discussion by the State Legislature; and (3) accreditation issues slated for changes under the reauthorization process for the federal Higher Education Act.

She noted that currently thirty-five accrediting associations are approved by the U.S. Department of Education, and that they were surveyed and compared to California's licensure standards and processes. She then discussed the differences between accreditation and state licensure, and concluded her remarks by summarizing the report's recommendations.

Commissioner Field pointed out that the accreditation process, although voluntary in practice, can force institutions to implement change when deficiencies are found.

Chair Welinsky asked who evaluates the accrediting associations.

Ms. Chisholm responded that the U.S. Department of Education has this responsibility.

**Legislative Update,
March 2004**

Staff member Marge Chisholm directed the Commissioners to a matrix of pending higher education legislation. Ms. Chisholm reminded the Commissioners that the bills on the matrix were either specific to the roles and function of the Commission, or addressed issues regarding access, affordability, and quality in higher education.

She noted that two bills were not on the matrix: Senate Bill 1535 (Karnette) and AB 2710 (Lui). Both addressed financial aid and/or student fee issues.

The Commission directed staff to review the proposed legislation to determine if their language was aligned to its student fee policy recommendations.

Ms. Chisholm noted that some of the Commission's student fee policy language was contained in the two bills.

Ms. Chisholm then discussed another bill, SB 1331 (Scott and Alpert) that would establish an accountability system to determine if the State, not institutions, was meeting its goals for higher education with respect to access, affordability, and quality issues.

After discussion, the Commission voted to take the following positions on the three bills:

SB 1535, "support in concept"; AB 2710, "watch"; and SB 1331, "support in concept".

Ms. Chisholm noted that AB 2923 (Lui) proposes to restructure the Commission as the California Postsecondary Education Policy and Finance Committee. Staff indicated that the bill is likely to undergo changes by the author. The Commission voted to take a “watch” position on that bill.

Recess Chair Welinsky recessed the Commission until March 10 at 9:30 a.m.

Call to order Chair Welinsky called the Wednesday, March 10, 2004 meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission to order at 9:40 a.m. in Room 113 of the State Capitol.

Call of the roll Executive Secretary Anna Gomez called the roll. A quorum was established.

Report of the Chair Chair Welinsky opened the meeting by announcing that several Commissioners had cast votes on several action items that had been held open from the previous day’s meeting and called for a vote on the following items:

1. Adoption of the “Recommendations on Higher Education Policies Contained in the Governor’s Proposed 2004-05 State Budget” report
2. Approval of the Moreno Valley Community College Campus
3. Approval of the Norco Community College Campus
4. Adoption of the “State Licensure versus Accreditation of Proprietary Schools and Colleges — A Review and Comparison of Roles and Functions” report
5. Legislative Update with Recommended Positions on Legislation
6. Executive Session report on the acceptance of Robert L. Moore’s resignation, effective April 1, 2004, and the appointment of Murray Haberman as Acting Director.

Commissioner Singh moved adoption of the above items, second by Commissioner Chandler. The Commission approved the items unanimously.

Title IX Athletics Compliance at California’s Public High Schools, Community Colleges, and Universities Chair Welinsky called on staff member Murray Haberman to present a report on Title IX Compliance. Mr. Haberman introduced RMC Research Corporation staff, Dr. Margaret Beam, Dr. Bonnie Faddis, and Dr. Pat Ruzicka. Mr. Haberman gave a short introduction and overview of the report, followed by comments from Karen Humphrey, representing the California Department of Education. Ms. Humphrey stressed that the goal of the study had been to work with an advisory committee to identify areas where gaps existed and assist schools with the tools to improve awareness and compliance. The RMC research team then gave a power point presentation outlining the major findings of the study.

Chair Welinsky called on Mary Gill, representing the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, to offer that system’s position on the recommendations. She noted

that it would be extremely difficult for the Chancellor's Office and the colleges to comply with the report's recommendations, and requested that the report be revised to address this concern with more realistic recommendations.

After much discussion by the Commissioners, Chair Welinsky suggested that, although the Commission endorsed efforts to bring more schools, colleges and universities into compliance, staff should develop language to address Ms. Gill's concerns. The motion to do so was made by Commissioner Chandler, seconded by Commissioner Woods-Jones and passed unanimously.

Chair Welinsky then assigned a subcommittee of the Commission to work with staff to develop final language. The Committee included Commissioners Chandler, Johnson, Washington and Woods-Jones.

**Faculty Salaries
at California's
Public Universities,
2004-05**

Chair Welinsky asked staff member Murray Haberman to present findings from the Commission's annual report *Faculty Salaries at California's Public Universities, 2004-05*. Mr. Haberman noted the lag between California's public university faculty salaries and those of the comparison institutions, and discussed the implications of lower salaries on the Universities' ability to recruit and retain faculty.

**Status of Improving
Teacher Quality
Grant Program**

Staff member Linda White presented a status report on the recently completed grant competition in which the Commission awarded over \$14 million for various teacher professional development activities.

**Status Report on the
Eligibility of California's
2003 High School
Graduates for
Admission to the State's
Public Universities**

Staff member Adrian Griffin presented an oral update on the status of the 2003 Eligibility Study, and discussed the background of the study, breadth of the sample of schools used to conduct the study, and the usefulness of the study to the segments. He added that the 2003 Eligibility Study was proceeding on schedule and would be released in mid- May 2004.

Other business

Chair Welinsky discussed the location of the next meeting and the possibility of meeting in Merced.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

MINUTES

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Meeting of March 30, 2004

**Commissioners
present** Howard Welinsky *Chair*
George T. Caplan
Carol Chandler
Odessa P. Johnson
Hugo Morales
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.
Evonne Seron Schulze
Dezie Woods-Jones

**Commissioners
absent**
Olivia K. Singh, *Vice Chair*
Alan S. Arkatov
Irwin S. Field
Reed Hastings
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Rachel E. Shetka
Faye Washington

Call to order Commission Chair Howard Welinsky called the meeting into session at 10:10 a.m. via teleconference call.

Call of the roll Commissioners present included Chair Welinsky, Commissioners Caplan, Chandler, Johnson, Morales, Rodriguez, Schulze, Woods-Jones.

Commissioners absent included Vice Chair Singh, Commissioners Arkatov, Field, Hastings, Pesqueira, Shetka, Washington.

**Title IX Athletics
Compliance at
California Public
High Schools,
Community
Colleges, and
Universities**

Chair Welinsky noted that the purpose of the meeting was to adopt the Commission's report *Title IX Athletics Compliance at California Public High Schools, Community Colleges, and Universities*.

He called on Commissioner Woods-Jones to report on the proceedings of a Commission subcommittee that had reviewed and revised the report based on suggestions made by the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges and the University of California Office of the President.

Commissioner Woods-Jones noted that the subcommittee had met on March 19, 2004, and had agreed to recommend the report with changes. She then called on Acting Executive Director Murray Haberman to report on the specific changes.

Mr. Haberman stated that the report had been revised to include language that would request, rather than require, the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges: (1) to provide professional development and training to community college administrators, athletic directors, and coaches; (2) that student interest surveys be con-

ducted regularly; and (3) that resources should be provided to the systemwide office to carry out the report's recommendations.

Mr. Haberman also noted some minor language changes for the section dealing with recommendations for the state public universities. In addition, he noted that language was added to the university section calling on the Governor and Legislature to provide resources necessary to carry out the Commission's recommendations pertaining to public universities.

Based on Mr. Haberman's comments, and with the support of the Commission's subcommittee to the Title IX study, Commissioner Woods-Jones moved the report, second by Commissioner Schulze, for adoption and transmittal to the Legislature.

On a voice vote, the Commission adopted the report unanimously.

Commissioner Woods-Jones asked Acting Executive Director Haberman when the report and its recommendations would be transmitted to the Governor and Legislature.

Mr. Haberman responded that the Commission would transmit the report jointly with the California Department of Education once Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell gave his final approval.

Adjournment There being no further business, Chair Welinsky adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

MINUTES

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Meeting of May 21, 2004

Commissioners present Howard Welinsky *Chair*
Olivia K. Singh, *Vice Chair*
George T. Caplan*
Irwin S. Field
Odessa P. Johnson*
Hugo Morales
Evonne Seron Schulze*
Rachel E. Shetka
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos*
Faye Washington*
**via teleconference*

Commissioners absent
Alan S. Arkatov
Carol Chandler
Reed Hastings
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.
Dezie Woods-Jones

Call to order Commission Chair Welinsky called the May 21, 2004, meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission to order at 9:40 a.m. in the California State Capitol, Senate Committee Room 3191, Sacramento, California. He asked for a call of the roll.

Call of the roll Executive Secretary Anna Gomez called the roll.

University Eligibility Study for the Class of 2003 Chair Welinsky stated that the Commission was meeting for the sole purpose of considering and adopting the report *University Eligibility Study for the Class of 2003*. Chair Welinsky placed the current report in historical context by stating that it was the seventh eligibility study to be conducted by the Commission and its predecessor agency. He also explained that this report was important because it documents how close the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC) come to meeting their Master Plan goals of drawing from the top 33 1/3% and 12.5% respectively of the public high school graduating classes. Chair Welinsky then introduced Acting Executive Director Murray Haberman to say a few words.

Mr. Haberman stated that the eligibility rates for the Class of 2003 were 28.8% for the CSU and 14.4% for UC. Mr. Haberman noted that, while the percentage of students eligible to attend UC was above the Master Plan guidelines, it was good news because it indicated that more students were being better prepared to attend the most prestigious public university in the nation. For the CSU, Mr. Haberman noted that the lower per-

centage of eligible students was good news in a different way since it is likely that if the CSU eligibility rate were closer to 33 1/3%, it would mean that a greater number of students attending CSU would require remediation.

Mr. Haberman introduced staff member Adrian Griffin to present the study findings.

Mr. Griffin discussed how the study was conducted. He noted that it was a joint effort among the CSU, UC, and the Commission, and indicated that 16,000 transcripts from the class of 2003 were analyzed. He stated that the transcripts were selected based on a sampling plan designed by a statistician from CSU, Sacramento and approved by all participants. Mr. Griffin noted that while the eligibility rates for African Americans and Latinos were still below their White and Asian counterparts, the eligibility rate for African Americans and Latinos was up substantially from the Commission's 1996 study. Mr. Griffin noted that the sample was carefully drawn to be reflective of all public high schools in the State, and that this was the first eligibility study to be conducted by using electronic transmittal of transcripts.

Commissioner Johnson expressed appreciation for the hard work of staff and noted that the University of California admits everyone who falls within the top 12.5%.

Commissioner Field noted that this was an excellent report but questioned whether all eligible students could be accommodated.

Mr. Griffin responded that this question could best be addressed by the university systems.

M.R.C. Greenwood, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs for the University of California, addressed the Commission. She stated that UC was very pleased with the study and its results. She noted that it demonstrates that public high school students are better prepared, and that UC's outreach programs were having a positive impact. Ms. Greenwood noted that UC would be considering ways to tighten up its eligibility requirements so that it can come closer to the 12.5% target, and that UC attempts to find enrollment opportunities for all eligible students in the top 12.5 %.

Commissioner Morales asked Ms. Greenwood how the proposed State budget would impact UC outreach programs.

Ms. Greenwood responded that UC is committed to maintaining its outreach efforts and will commit its own resources to doing so.

Commissioner Field asked how many of the students eligible to attend UC actually attend.

Ms. Greenwood responded that UC admitted about 47,000 freshmen this year, of which about 31,000 will enroll. She stated that the compact with Governor would allow UC to grow by about 5,000 freshmen per year starting with the academic year 2005.

Mr. Robert T. Teranishi, Assistant Professor, Higher Education Program, New York University, who asked to address the Commission, noted that the confidence range for the Asian population was fairly broad. He stated that it is likely reflective of the wide divergence within the Asian population in California.

Mr. Allison Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support, California State University Chancellor's Office, indicated that the CSU was pleased with the outcome of the study, and that he appreciated all the hard work that had gone into it. He noted that not all students who are eligible to attend CSU apply. He added that CSU continues to prioritize its enrollment by (1) continuing and returning students, (2) three levels of transfer students, and (3) first-time freshmen. Mr. Jones completed his comments by noting that CSU focuses its attention on those students who attend comprehensive public high schools.

Commissioner Morales asked Mr. Jones about the impact of budget cuts on outreach programs at the CSU.

Mr. Jones responded that outreach continues to be a priority for the CSU, and that any cuts to these programs would be proportional to overall reductions made to system.

Mr. Ron Fox, representing the California Department of Education, noted that Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell was pleased that emphasizing college preparation for public high school students was having a positive impact on eligibility.

Chair Welinsky called for a voice vote to adopt and transmit the report to the Governor and Legislature. The Commission unanimously voted so.

Adjournment Chair Welinsky adjourned the meeting at 10:28 a.m.
